

R. BRUCE RICH (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
Email: bruce.rich@weil.com  
RANDI W. SINGER (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
Email: randi.singer@weil.com  
REED L. COLLINS (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
Email: reed.collins@weil.com  
OLIVIA J. GREER (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
Email: olivia.greer@weil.com  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
Telephone: (212) 310-8000  
Facsimile: (212) 310-8007

Attorneys for Defendant  
EBAY INC.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

## BARRY ROSEN.

**Plaintiff,**

V.

EBAY, INC., and DOES 1 through 10,

### Defendants.

Case No. CV13-06801 MWF(Ex)

# **EBAY'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

## **Honorable Michael W. Fitzgerald**

Date: November 3, 2014

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 1600

1                   **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE FACTS .....	3
A.    Rosen's Failure to Document Registration of His Photos .....	3
B.    eBay and Its Copyright and Other Intellectual Property Compliance Programs .....	4
C.    Rosen's Speculation About Worthpoint and Terapeak .....	7
ARGUMENT.....	8
I.    Legal Standard.....	8
II.    Rosen Has Failed to Establish Registration of the Works at Issue .....	9
III.    Rosen's Claims as to the 8x10 Prints Fail On Multiple Additional Grounds .....	10
A.    eBay Is Shielded From Liability by the DMCA .....	10
B.    eBay Has Neither Directly Nor Secondarily Infringed Rosen's Copyrights in the 8x10 Prints .....	16
1.    eBay Did Not Directly Infringe Rosen's Copyrights .....	16
2.    eBay Did Not Secondarily Infringe Rosen's Copyrights in the 8x10 Prints .....	18
C.    eBay Is Not Liable for Worthpoint's Alleged Infringements .....	21
IV.    Rosen's Claims as to the Magazine Photos Also Fail on Multiple Grounds .....	22
A.    Digital Snapshots of the Magazines Posted in Connection with the Lawful Resale of the Magazines Are Fair Use .....	22
B.    eBay Did Not Directly Infringe Rosen's Copyrights in the Magazine Photos .....	24
C.    Rosen Cannot Establish Contributory or Vicarious Infringement.....	25
CONCLUSION.....	25

1  
2                   **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
3  
4

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>A&amp;M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001).....	17, 19, 20, 21
<i>Arista Records LLC v. Lime Grp. LLC</i> , 784 F. Supp. 2d 398 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).....	14
<i>Atl. Recording Corp. v. Howell</i> , 554 F. Supp. 2d 976 (D. Ariz. 2008).....	18
<i>In re Autohop Litig.</i> , No. 12 Civ. 4155 (LTS)(KNF), 2013 WL 5477495 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 1, 2013)...	16
<i>Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.</i> , 448 F.3d 605 (2d Cir. 2006) .....	23
<i>Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.</i> , 510 U.S. 569 (1994) .....	22
<i>Capital Records, LLC v. Vimeo, LLC</i> , 972 F. Supp. 2d 500 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	13
<i>Capitol Records, Inc. v. Thomas</i> , 579 F. Supp. 2d 1210 (D. Minn. 2008) .....	18
<i>Cartoon Network LP, LLLP v. CSC Holdings, Inc.</i> , 536 F.3d 121 (2d Cir. 2008) .....	16
<i>Columbia Pictures Indus. v. Fung</i> , 710 F.3d 1020 (9th Cir. 2013).....	14
<i>Cont'l Lab. Prods., Inc. v. Medax Int'l, Inc.</i> , 195 F.R.D. 675 (S.D. Cal. 2000) .....	8
<i>Corbis Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 351 F. Supp. 2d 1090 (W.D. Wash. 2004) .....	9, 15
<i>Costar Grp. Inc. v. Loopnet, Inc.</i> , 164 F. Supp. 2d 688 (D. Md. 2001), <i>aff'd</i> , 373 F.3d 544 (4th Cir. 2004) .....	25

1	<i>Disney Enters. v. Hotfile Corp.</i> , No. 11-20427-CIV, 2013 WL 6336286 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 20, 2013) .....	20
3	<i>Elektra Entm't Grp. v. Barker</i> , 551 F. Supp. 2d 234 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....	18
5	<i>Ellison v. Robertson</i> , 357 F. 3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2004).....	14, 21
7	<i>Fox Broad. Co. v. Dish Network LLC</i> , 747 F.3d 1060 (9th Cir. 2014).....	16, 17
9	<i>Hendrickson v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 165 F. Supp. 2d 1082 (C.D. Cal. 2001).....	10, 13
11	<i>Hotaling v. Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints</i> , 118 F.3d 199 (4th Cir. 1997).....	17
13	<i>Io Grp., Inc. v. Veoh Networks, Inc.</i> , 586 F. Supp. 2d 1132 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	10, 11, 13
15	<i>Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.</i> , 336 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2003).....	23, 24
17	<i>Kodadek v. MTV Networks, Inc.</i> , 152 F.3d 1209 (9th Cir. 1998).....	9
19	<i>London-Sire Records, Inc. v. Doe 1</i> , 542 F. Supp. 2d 153 (D. Mass. 2008).....	18
21	<i>Luvdarts, LLC v. AT&amp;T Mobility, LLC</i> , 710 F.3d 1068 (9th Cir. 2013).....	20
23	<i>In re Napster, Inc. Copyright Litig.</i> , 377 F. Supp. 2d 796 (N.D. Cal. 2005).....	18
25	<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 508 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2007).....	17, 19
26	<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. CCBill LLC</i> , 488 F.3d 1102 (9th Cir. 2007).....	15
28	<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Cybernet Ventures, Inc.</i> , 213 F. Supp. 2d 1146 (C.D. Cal. 2002).....	13

1	<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Giganews, Inc.</i> , No. 11-cv-7098 AHM, 2013 WL 2109963 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2013) ...	16, 17, 24
3	<i>Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa Int'l Serv. Ass'n</i> , 494 F.3d 788 (9th Cir. 2007).....	18, 19, 20
5	<i>Provenz v. Miller</i> , 102 F.3d 1478 (9th Cir. 1996).....	8
7	<i>Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Netcom On-Line Commc'n Servs., Inc.</i> , 907 F. Supp. 1361 (N.D. Cal. 1995).....	25
9	<i>Rosen v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. CV 12-10413 ABC (Ex) (C.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2014) .....	8
10	<i>Rosen v. Hosting Servs., Inc.</i> , 771 F. Supp. 2d 1219 (C.D. Cal. 2010).....	18
12	<i>Soremekun v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.</i> , 509 F.3d 978 (9th Cir. 2007).....	21
14	<i>Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 576 F. Supp. 2d 463 (S.D.N.Y. 2008), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd in part</i> , 600 F.3d 93 (2d Cir. 2010) .....	4, 6
17	<i>UMG Recordings, Inc. v. Shelter Capital Partners LLC</i> , 718 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2013).....	12, 13, 19
18	<b>Statutes and Rules</b>	
20	17 U.S.C. § 107(1).....	22
21	17 U.S.C. § 107(2).....	23
22	17 U.S.C. § 107(3).....	23
23	17 U.S.C. § 107(4).....	23
24	17 U.S.C. § 109(a).....	22
25	17 U.S.C. § 411(a) .....	9
27	17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(A).....	11, 12
28	17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(B) .....	13, 14

1	17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(C) .....	11
2	17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(2) .....	15
3	17 U.S.C. § 512(g)(2)(c).....	6
4	17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(1)(A).....	15
5	17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(1)(B).....	15
6	Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) .....	8
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Defendant eBay Inc. (“eBay”) submits this memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to Plaintiff’s motion for partial summary judgment as to liability (Dkt. 94) (“Motion”).

## **INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff Barry Rosen's attempt to hold eBay liable for direct, contributory, and vicarious infringement of some 39 of his allegedly copyrighted photographs consists of a scattershot array of arguments that have no basis in law or fact. As a threshold matter, Rosen has failed even to establish that the photographs at issue were registered with the Copyright Office, which is fatal to his claims and moots every other issue in the case. Even if the Court were to reach the merits, Rosen's claims fail on multiple grounds.

Rather than separate out the two distinct categories of photographs at issue, Rosen's brief ignores these differences, and thereby fails to acknowledge, let alone address, the separate dispositive legal issues pertaining to each. But as set forth in eBay's own summary judgment motion, analyzing these categories separately provides the proper legal framework for resolving this dispute.

The first category of images consists of 8"x10" prints of seventeen claimed Rosen photographs (the "8x10 Prints") that third parties listed for sale on eBay's website, [www.ebay.com](http://www.ebay.com). Rosen claims that the online listings for these images infringed his copyrights, but he completely ignores the dispositive legal safe harbor afforded eBay under section 512(c) of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA"), 17 U.S.C. § 512(c). The record conclusively demonstrates that Bay complied with the DMCA notice-and-takedown requirements with respect to the 8x10 Prints, which defeats Rosen's claims directed to these works. Rosen's claims as to the 8x10 Prints also fail on other grounds as well. There is, for example, no merit to Rosen's novel theory that the temporary retention of *storage* copies of the

1 images out of the public eye somehow deprives eBay of the intended DMCA  
 2 protections.

3       The second category of images involves listings by third parties on eBay's  
 4 website for resales of magazines that allegedly contain one or more of Rosen's  
 5 photographs (the "Magazine Photos").<sup>1</sup> The import of Rosen's claims as to the  
 6 Magazine Photos is nothing short of breathtaking: he would hold liable online  
 7 sellers who accurately depict merchandise containing copyrighted images owned by  
 8 another, thereby bringing countless lawful secondary-market transactions to a halt.  
 9 But it is uncontested that the publishers were licensed to use Rosen's photographs  
 10 in these magazines, and copyright law makes clear that the owner of a lawfully  
 11 made copy of a copyrighted work has the right to resell it under the "first sale"  
 12 doctrine. The use of Rosen's images in this context plainly constitutes fair use, as it  
 13 entails a transformative use for a purpose entirely different from that of the original  
 14 published photographs. Rosen has adduced no evidence of any potential lost sales  
 15 or license opportunities caused by this non-superseding, transformative use.

16       Grasping for a viable theory of liability, Rosen devotes inordinate briefing to  
 17 the specious argument that eBay is liable for infringements allegedly committed by  
 18 non-party Worthpoint, with which, Rosen concedes, eBay has no direct  
 19 relationship. Rosen and his proffered expert attempt to spin misinterpreted facts  
 20 and bald speculation into a fictive scenario in which eBay might somehow be  
 21 implicated in Worthpoint's purported infringements. The undisputed record  
 22 evidence provides no basis for this claim.

23       Accordingly, Rosen's motion for summary judgment should be denied.<sup>2</sup>  
 24

---

25       <sup>1</sup> The chart attached hereto as Appendix A sets out which paragraphs of the Second  
 26 Amended Complaint pertain to the 8x10 Prints and which to the Magazine Photos.

27       <sup>2</sup> eBay's arguments in support of its own motion for summary judgment do not  
 28 require the Court to consider or decide the copyright registration issue, nor do they  
 rely upon unsupported and conclusory allegations or the uninformed musings of a  
 supposed "expert" who has never actually examined eBay's systems. Instead,

## **COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE FACTS**

#### A. Rosen's Failure to Document Registration of His Photos

Rosen alleges that he is a professional photographer and contends that eBay infringed his registered copyrights in thirty-nine photographs. Motion at 1. But there is no evidence that any of the photographs at issue are covered by the registration certificates Rosen has produced. The certificates in the record fall into two categories: (i) ten group registrations which, collectively, are alleged to cover 25 of the works at issue, and (ii) fourteen single registrations, which allegedly cover the remaining fourteen works. *See* Declaration of Barry Rosen, dated Sept. 4, 2014 (Dkt. 94) (“Rosen Decl.”), Ex. 1. The group registrations bear titles such as “Published Works 1998 Pt 1 . . . appx. 42 photos,” but the certificates do not identify any of the dozens of individual photographs that comprise each collection. *See id.* The single registrations bear titles such as “Daisy Fuentes,” and the titles sometimes include what appears to be a number from a series of photographs of the same subject, such as “Anna Kournikova 15.” *See id.* But these certificates do not further describe or identify the particular photographs being registered. In short, Rosen has failed meaningfully to tie these asserted registration certificates to the actual images that are the subject of this lawsuit.

19 Proof that the allegedly infringing photographs are covered by Rosen’s  
20 registrations would require demonstrating that the deposit copies of the works  
21 covered by the registrations submitted by Rosen to the Copyright Office constitute  
22 or, as to the group registrations, include the challenged images. But Rosen did not  
23 save copies of those deposit copies or, for that matter, keep a clear record of what  
24 he submitted to the Copyright Office. *See* eBay’s Statement of Genuine Disputes  
25 of Material Fact, filed October 3, 2014 (“56.2”) ¶ 1. Despite eBay’s requests to  
26 produce or procure such copies, Rosen has been unwilling or unable to do so. *Id.*

27 eBay's legal arguments are built upon competent and admissible evidence as to  
28 which there is no genuine issue of material fact.

1                   **B. eBay and Its Copyright and Other Intellectual Property  
2                   Compliance Programs**

3                   As set forth more fully in eBay's summary judgment motion, eBay is one of  
4                   the world's largest online marketplaces, connecting a diverse, global community of  
5                   buyers and sellers, both individuals and small businesses. *See* eBay's Proposed  
6                   Statement of Uncontroverted Facts and Conclusions of Law, filed Sept. 5, 2014  
7                   (Dkt. 74) ("56.1") ¶¶ 9-12.<sup>3</sup> eBay does not itself buy or sell merchandise on its  
8                   website; instead, third parties offer goods or services for sale on the site. *Id.* ¶ 15.  
9                   It is the legal and contractual responsibility of such users to comply with  
10                  appropriate laws pertaining to sales of their items, including respecting third-party  
11                  intellectual property rights.

12                  Contrary to Rosen's assertion that eBay takes "no steps" to impede the sale  
13                  of items that infringe intellectual property rights, Motion at 9, eBay employs  
14                  myriad measures and expends enormous resources directed specifically at impeding  
15                  infringement. *See* 56.1 ¶¶ 18-56, 113-17. Indeed, it is eBay's abiding philosophy  
16                  that maintaining a clean, "well-lit" marketplace, and thereby earning the continued  
17                  good will of its users, is critical to its commercial success. *Id.* ¶ 19.

18                  It is curious that Rosen has chosen to rely heavily, albeit highly selectively,  
19                  on factual findings by the district court in *Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. eBay, Inc.*, 576 F.  
20                  Supp. 2d 463 (S.D.N.Y. 2008), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 600 F.3d 93 (2d Cir.  
21                  2010), a trademark infringement case in which eBay's conduct was completely  
22                  vindicated. Virtually the entirety of the factual findings in that case (including, but  
23                  not limited to, those excerpted by Rosen) demonstrate eBay's exemplary  
24                  intellectual property compliance efforts. In particular, as the Second Circuit noted  
25                  on appeal, eBay devotes extraordinary resources to averting infringements of all

---

26                  <sup>3</sup> To reduce duplication of facts submitted to the Court in connection with the  
27                  parties' cross-motions, eBay cites, where applicable, the facts presented with its  
28                  own Motion for Summary Judgment, filed September 5, 2014 (Dkt. 73) ("eBay's  
                 Motion for Summary Judgment").

1 types on its site. *See* 600 F.3d at 98, 100 (noting that eBay deploys hundreds of  
 2 employees, has spent “as much as \$20 million each year on tools to promote trust  
 3 and safety on its website,” and has “consistently” taken steps to improve its  
 4 technology to protect intellectual property and prevent fraud).

5 The *Tiffany* court’s findings fully align with the undisputed fact record here  
 6 as to: (i) eBay’s limited ability to detect infringements on its website, both because  
 7 it does not take ownership or custody of items sold and because it is not sufficiently  
 8 familiar with the products offered by the thousands of rights owners whose  
 9 merchandise is sold through the eBay website, 600 F.3d at 98; 56.1 ¶ 17; and (ii)  
 10 eBay’s robust “notice-and-takedown” system, which enables rights holders who  
 11 believe listings violate their intellectual property rights to notify eBay promptly and  
 12 easily, 600 F.3d at 99; 56.1 ¶¶ 20-22, 36-56.<sup>4</sup>

13 Given that eBay’s website processes some 22 million user-uploaded images  
 14 per day, examination and review of each image by eBay’s employees is simply not  
 15 feasible. 56.1 ¶¶ 17, 59. eBay employees do not create listings for eBay users,  
 16 nor, contrary to Rosen’s suggestion, can they “control” the posting of images in  
 17 connection with those listings, Motion at 5, other than to specify certain technical  
 18 requirements (such as pixel count) so that the images are compatible with eBay’s  
 19 systems. *See* 56.1 ¶¶ 60-61; 56.2 ¶ 16. eBay simply provides tools and technology  
 20 that allow third-party sellers to create listings that buyers can view. 56.1 ¶¶ 57, 63.  
 21 Once initiated by a seller, both the creation of a listing page and the uploading and  
 22 storage of any images are fully automated. 56.1 ¶ 61.<sup>5</sup>

---

23           <sup>4</sup> eBay has suspended tens of thousands of repeat offenders in various ways  
 24 depending on the frequency and severity of their violations, ranging from  
 25 temporary restrictions on the number of items a seller may list at any given time to  
 permanent suspension of the seller’s account. 56.1 ¶¶ 32-35, 116.

26           <sup>5</sup> When a seller uploads or references such an image, eBay’s back-end infrastructure  
 27 automatically stores a copy of the image for use in connection with the listing. *Id.* ¶  
 70. Image files are stored on eBay’s servers using an automatically generated URL.  
*Id.* ¶¶ 71-73. eBay’s systems automatically populate listings pages with the  
 appropriate image file. *Id.* ¶ 74.

1           Although eBay cannot pre-screen the many millions of images added to its  
 2 website each day, through its Verified Rights Owner (“VeRO”) Program (among  
 3 other means), eBay provides efficient mechanisms for rights owners to submit a  
 4 Notice of Claimed Infringement (“NOCI”) as to particular listings. 56.1 ¶¶ 39, 45.  
 5 Again contrary to Rosen’s unsupported allegations, *see Motion at 9*, eBay’s  
 6 takedown responses are exemplary, *see Tiffany*, 600 F.3d at 99; in the case of  
 7 Rosen’s 8x10 Prints, listings containing those images were taken down within 24  
 8 hours. *See 56.1 ¶¶ 47-48, 88-89.*<sup>6</sup> What is more, eBay’s practice, which it followed  
 9 here to the letter, is to notify the sellers and all bidders of the action taken and to  
 10 refund any fees associated with the terminated listing, among other things. *Id.* ¶¶  
 11 50-52; *see also* 56.2 ¶ 34 (citing Baldwin Declaration).

12           Rosen touts the fact that for a period of time after a given listing has been  
 13 taken down, image files formerly associated with the listing may still temporarily  
 14 “reside on eBay’s servers.” *Motion at 9.*<sup>7</sup> This technological artifact of a taken-  
 15 down listing does not alter the dispositive facts that: (1) the listing is no longer  
 16 included in the results of searches on eBay’s website; (2) users browsing the  
 17 website are no longer able to view the listing; (3) any attempt to revisit the listing  
 18 using a saved copy of its URL (such as through a web browser “bookmark”) will  
 19 return only a notice that the listing is no longer available; and (4) the image URL,  
 20

---

21           <sup>6</sup> Rosen’s chart summarizing his claims reflects that for all but three of the 8x10  
 22 “Prints” identified in the fifth column, the “date of last known listing infringement”  
 23 was no more than one day after the “Takedown Notice [was] Sent by Rosen to  
 24 eBay.” Rosen Decl. ¶ 36 & Ex. 176. In just two instances, eBay took two days,  
 responding on a Sunday to a notice sent on Friday. *See id.* Ex. 176 at 6; 56.2 ¶¶  
 217, 220. In one instance, Rosen’s chart asserts incorrectly that eBay took almost a  
 month to take down a listing, *see id.* at 7, but the record evidence does not support  
 his assertion. *See 56.2 ¶ 270.*

25           <sup>7</sup> There are a number of legitimate reasons that eBay’s systems provide for the  
 26 temporary retention of the image files formerly associated with taken-down listings.  
 27 56.1 ¶ 54. These include that the DMCA requires service providers to restore  
 removed content (including images) upon receipt of a valid DMCA counter-notice.  
*See 17 U.S.C. § 512(g)(2)(c); 56.1 ¶ 54.* The images stored on eBay’s servers are  
 28 not permanent; each has a default expiration date (generally 90 days after a listing  
 ends). 56.1 ¶¶ 76-77.

1 which is required to access the image, is no longer available on eBay’s website.  
 2 *See* 56.1 ¶¶ 53-54, 78-79. Short of intentionally keeping copies of image URLs for  
 3 purposes of future litigation, as Rosen did, *see* 56.2 ¶ 267, Rosen offers no plausible  
 4 theory of how anyone would have accessed images from taken-down listings. And  
 5 indeed, the record reveals no instances of anyone accessing Rosen’s claimed  
 6 images after the listings were taken down—apart, perhaps, from Rosen himself,  
 7 who claims to have done so but has no proof to support that claim. *See* 56.1 ¶¶ 94-  
 8 97; 56.2 ¶ 7; *see also infra* pp. 11-12.

### 9           **C. Rosen’s Speculation About Worthpoint and Terapeak**

10 Rosen asserts that three of his photographs appeared on an unaffiliated non-  
 11 party website, www.worthpoint.com (“Worthpoint”). *See* Second Amended  
 12 Complaint (Dkt. 15) (“SAC”) ¶¶ 117-20. Although Rosen does not and cannot  
 13 assert that eBay has a contractual relationship with Worthpoint, 56.1 ¶ 119, Rosen  
 14 tries to link eBay to certain claimed infringements on Worthpoint’s website by  
 15 virtue of eBay’s license relationship with an entirely separate entity, Terapeak.  
 16 Rosen speculates that, insofar as eBay has a relationship with Terapeak, and  
 17 Terapeak has a “partnership” relationship with Worthpoint—the nature and terms  
 18 of which Rosen does not specify—it somehow follows that eBay is responsible for  
 19 the claimed Worthpoint infringements. *See* Motion at 8. Rosen’s supposed “facts”  
 20 regarding Worthpoint and Terapeak consist entirely of hearsay and speculation.  
 21 Specifically, the unsworn statements appearing on Worthpoint’s and Terapeak’s  
 22 websites purporting to explain their relationship with one another and their use of  
 23 eBay’s data are inadmissible hearsay, *see* Motion at 8; Rosen Decl. Exs. 170-72,  
 24 while the Declaration of David Sterling offers mere conjecture by a previously  
 25 undisclosed “expert” who has no knowledge of eBay’s operations or its business  
 26 dealings with third parties. Unsurprisingly, a number of Mr. Sterling’s assertions  
 27  
 28

1 are simply wrong. *See generally* Declaration of Randy Spickler, dated Oct. 2, 2014  
 2 (“Spickler Decl.”).<sup>8</sup>

3 **ARGUMENT**

4 **I. LEGAL STANDARD**

5 Summary judgment is appropriate only where there exists no genuine issue  
 6 as to any material fact, and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of  
 7 law. *See Fed. R. Civ. P.* 56(a). In considering a motion for summary judgment, the  
 8 court views the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party and  
 9 draws all reasonable inferences in the non-moving party’s favor. *Provenz v. Miller*,  
 10 102 F.3d 1478, 1483 (9th Cir. 1996). “Where material factual disputes exist, the  
 11 court must allow a jury to resolve the factual disputes.” *Id.*

12 The movant may not rely on testimony from experts not disclosed during  
 13 discovery. *See Cont'l Lab. Prods., Inc. v. Medax Int'l, Inc.*, 195 F.R.D. 675, 677  
 14 (S.D. Cal. 2000) (striking from record affidavits submitted by experts in opposition  
 15 to summary judgment motion where the plaintiff failed to disclose the experts  
 16 during discovery and the defendants were prejudiced). Nor may the movant rely on  
 17 testimony that he refused to provide during his deposition. *See Order Denying*  
 18 Plaintiff Barry Rosen’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment at 2-3, *Rosen v.*  
 19 *Amazon.com, Inc.*, No. CV 12-10413 ABC (Ex) (C.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2014) (Dkt. 71)  
 20 (striking Rosen’s “blatant attempt to ‘re-do’ his deposition” by submitting a  
 21 declaration addressing questions he could not or would not answer at his  
 22 deposition).

23

24

25

---

26 <sup>8</sup> Contrary to Mr. Sterling’s speculation, while eBay does transmit data files to  
 27 Terapeak containing certain information about items sold, these data files do *not*  
 28 include image files, nor does eBay license the use of sellers’ images to Terapeak.  
 56.2 ¶ 33.

1           **II. ROSEN HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH REGISTRATION OF THE**  
 2           **WORKS AT ISSUE**

3           As a threshold matter, Rosen has failed to establish that he registered the  
 4           copyrights in the works sued upon, as he must to maintain a copyright infringement  
 5           action. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 411(a); *Kodadek v. MTV Networks, Inc.*, 152 F.3d 1209,  
 6           1211 (9th Cir. 1998). Rosen asserts that the registration certificates in the record  
 7           cover the photographs at issue, *see* Rosen Decl. ¶¶ 2-3 & Ex. 1, but the certificates  
 8           do not identify the particular photographs they cover, and there is no other record  
 9           evidence linking Rosen’s registrations to any of the photographs allegedly  
 10          infringed. *See supra* p. 3.

11          This failure to prove registration precludes summary judgment for Rosen on  
 12          all of his copyright infringement claims. *See Corbis Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,  
 13          351 F. Supp. 2d 1090, 1114-15 (W.D. Wash. 2004), *overruled on other grounds by*  
 14          *Cosmetic Ideas, Inc. v. IAC/InteractiveCorp*, 606 F.3d 612 (9th Cir. 2010). In  
 15          *Corbis*, there was “nothing on the face of the certificates . . . to confirm that the  
 16          Christensen Photo [was] included among the deposited photos,” which meant that  
 17           “[t]he only way to determine with any certainty whether [the registrations] cover  
 18          the Christensen Photo [was] to review a copy of the deposits included with the  
 19          registration applications.” *Id.*<sup>9</sup> But Corbis, like Rosen, had never “bothered to  
 20          obtain a copy of the deposits and provide them to the Court.” *Id.* at 1115. The  
 21          court therefore denied summary judgment for the plaintiff on the ground that  
 22           “[w]ithout the deposit, Corbis cannot show that the Christensen Photo is among the  
 23          photographs covered” by the registrations. *Id.* Similarly here, there is no record  
 24          evidence tying Rosen’s certificates to the particular photographs allegedly  
 25          infringed, which precludes summary judgment for Rosen.

26  
 27          

---

<sup>9</sup> Corbis had produced a spreadsheet purporting to link the registrations with the  
 28          Christensen Photo, but there was “no way to corroborate this link.” *Id.* at 1114.

1           **III. ROSEN'S CLAIMS AS TO THE 8X10 PRINTS FAIL ON MULTIPLE  
2           ADDITIONAL GROUNDS**

3           **A. eBay Is Shielded From Liability by the DMCA**

4 Rosen's motion conspicuously fails even to acknowledge, let alone address,  
5 the DMCA, which protects online service providers like eBay<sup>10</sup> from precisely the  
6 sorts of claims brought here concerning listings for the 8x10 Prints. *See* 17 U.S.C.  
7 § 512(c) (providing safe harbor for "storage at the direction of a user of material  
8 that resides on a system or network controlled or operated by or for the service  
9 provider" if certain conditions have been met). As discussed below and in eBay's  
10 cross-motion, eBay's VeRO Program, as implemented, met all of the statutory  
11 requirements for section 512(c) safe-harbor protection as to the complained-of 8x10  
12 Prints. 56.1 ¶ 41; eBay's Motion for Summary Judgment at 12-16.

13 Specifically, each time Rosen used eBay's tools to report a listing of an 8x10  
14 Print, eBay complied with the DMCA by promptly taking the reported listings  
15 down. 56.1 ¶¶ 85-89. To the extent Rosen's argument might be construed to imply  
16 that the DMCA safe-harbor protections are not available to eBay because copies of  
17 his images remained stored out of the public eye on eBay's servers after the listings  
18 were taken down, *see* Motion at 9, 17, 22, 25, the argument has no merit.

19           **Storage at the Direction of a User.** The section 512(c) safe harbor applies  
20 to infringing material stored on the service provider's system "at the direction of a  
21 user." 17 U.S.C. § 512(c); *see Io Grp., Inc. v. Veoh Networks, Inc.*, 586 F. Supp. 2d  
22 1132, 1146 (N.D. Cal. 2008). Rosen's claims focus on eBay's processing of his  
23 images, but the dispositive fact under the DMCA is that *eBay users selected the*  
24 *images for their listings* and uploaded them using eBay's automated tools. *See*  
25 *supra* p. 5. Every step in creating the listings, including copying the images to

---

26  
27           <sup>10</sup> "eBay clearly meets the DMCA's broad definition of online 'service provider.'" "*Hendrickson v. eBay, Inc.*", 165 F. Supp. 2d 1082, 1088 (C.D. Cal. 2001) (citing 17  
28 U.S.C. § 512(k)(1)(B)).

1 accompany those listings, was initiated by users, not by eBay, *see id.*, such that  
 2 eBay's hosting of the images clearly falls within the scope of section 512(c). *See*  
 3 *Io*, 586 F. Supp. 2d at 1147-48 (holding that section 512(c) covers "automated  
 4 processing of user-submitted content").

5 **Expeditious Response.** Section 512(c) also requires that upon receiving a  
 6 notification of claimed infringement from a copyright owner, the service provider  
 7 must "respond[] expeditiously to remove, or disable access to, the material that is  
 8 claimed to be infringing." 17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(C). The record confirms that  
 9 eBay expeditiously took down every reported listing for the 8x10 Prints upon  
 10 receiving notification from Rosen. *See supra* p. 6. The only instance in which  
 11 Rosen even alleges that a listing for an 8x10 Print "wasn't expeditiously removed,"  
 12 SAC ¶ 106, involved a Monday morning take-down in response to a Sunday-  
 13 afternoon notification. 56.1 ¶¶ 90-91.<sup>11</sup>

14 **Remove or Disable Access.** Rosen's contention that certain images  
 15 remained temporarily stored on eBay's servers after eBay removed listings for the  
 16 8x10 Prints has no legal significance. *See Motion* at 9, 17, 22, 25. By taking the  
 17 listings down, eBay in every practical and realistic sense "remove[d], or disable[d]  
 18 access to, the material." 17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(C). Searches of eBay's website no  
 19 longer would have returned the listings (or images associated with them), and any  
 20 attempt to revisit a listing using a saved copy of its URL would have returned only  
 21 a notice that the listing was no longer available. *See supra* p. 6. This explains why  
 22 Rosen has failed to show that *anyone other than perhaps himself* (and even that is  
 23 disputed) accessed the images on eBay's servers after eBay took the listings down.  
 24 *See* 56.1 ¶¶ 94-97; 56.2 ¶¶ 7, 24. Rosen himself went to extraordinary lengths—  
 25 solely to build a litigation record—to locate these images on eBay's servers after  
 26

27 

---

<sup>11</sup> eBay was unaware of the alleged infringements prior to receiving these NOCIs.  
 28 56.1 ¶ 88; *see* 17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(A).

1 the listings were taken down.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, Rosen conceded he does not know if  
 2 cached copies of the images were cleared from his own computer before he  
 3 attempted to “access” the images on eBay’s servers. 56.1 ¶ 94. Accordingly, Rosen  
 4 has failed even to show that *he* accessed eBay’s server copies instead of merely  
 5 viewing the cached copies automatically saved locally on his own computer while  
 6 the listings were still active. 56.2 ¶¶ 7, 267 (citing Spickler Decl.). Indeed,  
 7 contrary to his allegations, Rosen testified at his deposition that *he did not believe*  
 8 *he was accessing images on eBay’s servers*, but that he was instead accessing  
 9 images stored locally on his own computer—meaning that he is seeking to hold  
 10 eBay liable for the contents of his own hard drive. *Id.* ¶ 267 (citing Rosen Dep.  
 11 187:17-189:20, 192:6-193:25, 247:3-248:8).<sup>13</sup>

12 In all events, the fact that, for legitimate reasons—and without allowing  
 13 continued public access to the images—eBay temporarily maintains images  
 14 delinked from taken-down listings (*see supra* note 7) should not disqualify eBay or,  
 15 by extension, countless other websites, from the protections of the section 512(c)  
 16 safe harbor. To conclude otherwise would exalt technological form over real-world  
 17 substance. *See UMG Recordings, Inc. v. Shelter Capital Partners LLC*, 718 F.3d  
 18 1006, 1019 (9th Cir. 2013) (section 512(c) “recognizes that one is unlikely to  
 19 infringe a copyright by merely storing material that no one could access”). To  
 20

---

21 <sup>12</sup> As noted above, if Rosen accessed an image stored on eBay’s servers after the  
 22 listing was taken down, it was only because he copied and saved the image’s unique  
 23 URL from a web browser while the listing was active. *See supra* pp. 6-7. Rosen  
 24 testified that he copied and saved the image URLs by creating a PDF file of each  
 25 listing and storing the PDF on his computer; the PDF contained any images  
 26 associated with the listing, along with their URLs. *See* 56.2 ¶ 267.

27 <sup>13</sup> Nor could Rosen’s assertion that he accessed server images via third-party search  
 28 engines such as Google give rise to any liability on the part of eBay. Third-party  
 29 search engines do not access images on eBay’s servers after eBay takes down the  
 30 listings. *See* 56.2 ¶ 267 (citing Spickler Decl.). Rather, search engines crawl  
 31 eBay’s website and may make a thumbnail copy of an image contained in a listing  
 32 while the listing is active. That copy is stored *on the search engine’s own servers*  
 33 and may be accessible even after eBay takes the listing down because eBay has no  
 34 control over (and consequently no liability for) the search engine’s copies. *See id.*

1 formalistically require a complete expunging even of storage copies of the type  
 2 temporarily maintained by eBay also would impede eBay's ability to perform other  
 3 legally mandated and operationally efficient functions. *See supra* note 7.

4 **Right and Ability to Control / Direct Financial Benefit.** Section 512(c)  
 5 also requires that the defendant "not receive a financial benefit directly attributable  
 6 to the infringing activity, in a case in which the service provider has the right and  
 7 ability to control such activity." 17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(1)(B). Rosen's argument fails  
 8 to address, let alone satisfy, the legal test governing this provision.

9 First, Rosen's "right and ability to control" argument relies on the common-  
 10 law standard for vicarious infringement and ignores the different and more  
 11 demanding standard of control under the DMCA. The DMCA requires an intimate  
 12 level of involvement by the defendant in the alleged infringement, i.e., control of  
 13 infringing conduct that goes well beyond the type of control that is required to  
 14 implement the remedial measures mandated by the DMCA. *See UMG*, 718 F.3d at  
 15 1029-30; *Capital Records, LLC v. Vimeo, LLC*, 972 F. Supp. 2d 500, 526-35  
 16 (S.D.N.Y. 2013); *Hendrickson*, 165 F. Supp. 2d at 1093-94 (holding that eBay  
 17 lacked the right and ability to control infringing activity under the DMCA).  
 18 Control for purposes of section 512(c)(1)(B) means "something more" than just the  
 19 "general ability to locate infringing material and terminate users' access." *UMG*,  
 20 718 F.3d at 1030. The requisite control exists only when a service provider  
 21 "exert[s] substantial influence on the activities of users." *Id.* (quoting *Viacom Int'l, Inc. v. YouTube, Inc.*, 676 F.3d 19, 38 (2d Cir. 2012)). Substantial influence, in  
 22 turn, entails exercising substantial and direct authority over infringing conduct,  
 23 such as promulgating "detailed instructions regard[ing] issues of layout,  
 24 appearance, and content" and then actively monitoring users' compliance with  
 25 those instructions. *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Cybernet Ventures, Inc.*, 213 F. Supp. 2d  
 26 1146, 1173 (C.D. Cal. 2002), *cited in UMG*, 718 F.3d at 1030; *see also Io*, 586 F.  
 27 Supp. 2d at 1153 (holding that the defendant lacked right and ability to control  
 28

1 infringing activity where there was “no suggestion that Veoh aims to encourage  
 2 copyright infringement on its system [and] no evidence that Veoh can control what  
 3 content users choose to upload before it is uploaded”). Rosen has not claimed, let  
 4 alone proved, that eBay engaged in any such conduct in relation to the challenged  
 5 listings.

6       This failure of proof makes unnecessary consideration of any asserted  
 7 financial benefit reaped by eBay from activities that demonstrably did *not* entail a  
 8 right or ability to control infringing activity within the meaning of section  
 9 512(c)(1)(B). Nonetheless, the record discloses that eBay receives no financial  
 10 benefit from the listings it takes down and did not so benefit from listings for the  
 11 8x10 Prints. To the contrary, eBay refunds all fees when it takes down a listing, as  
 12 it did in response to each of Rosen’s NOCIs for the 8x10 Prints. 56.2 ¶ 34.

13       Equally unavailing is Rosen’s bald assertion that eBay “increases its ability  
 14 to charge for advertising on its website” by hosting infringing material that  
 15 allegedly serves as a “‘draw’ for customers.” Motion at 18-19. Establishing that  
 16 infringement is a “draw” requires evidence of a “causal relationship” between  
 17 infringing activity and the defendant’s profit. *Ellison v. Robertson*, 357 F. 3d 1072,  
 18 1079 (9th Cir. 2004). This can be shown only where the defendant cultivates  
 19 infringement to attract users. *See, e.g., Columbia Pictures Indus. v. Fung*, 710 F.3d  
 20 1020, 1045 (9th Cir. 2013) (defendant “attracted primarily visitors who were  
 21 seeking to engage in infringing activity, as that is mostly what occurred on his sites;  
 22 and encouraged that infringing activity”); *Arista Records LLC v. Lime Grp. LLC*,  
 23 784 F. Supp. 2d 398, 428 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (defendant “promoted [its] infringing  
 24 capabilities” and “assisted users in committing infringement”). Rosen’s cynical and  
 25 unfounded characterizations of eBay’s conduct are belied by the record, which  
 26 reflects a corporate culture and practices aimed at *reducing* instances of  
 27 infringement on eBay’s site. eBay’s conduct is thus the antithesis of using  
 28 infringement as a “draw” for customers. *See supra* pp. 4-6.

1           **Other Requirements.** Finally, eBay satisfies all other applicable  
 2 requirements for the section 512(c) safe harbor.

3           First, there is no dispute that eBay has designated an agent to receive  
 4 notifications of claimed infringement and displays the agent's contact information  
 5 online. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 512(c)(2); 56.1 ¶ 117.

6           Second, eBay has adopted and reasonably implemented a policy that  
 7 provides for terminating, in appropriate circumstances, the accounts of sellers who  
 8 are repeat infringers, *see* 17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(1)(A); *supra* note 4, and informs its  
 9 users of this policy on its website. *See* § 512(i)(1)(A); 56.1 ¶ 115. Indeed, the  
 10 record shows that eBay has suspended tens of thousands of repeat offenders  
 11 pursuant to an escalating series of penalties ranging from temporary restrictions on  
 12 the number of items a seller may list to permanent suspension of the seller's  
 13 account. 56.1 ¶¶ 32-35, 116. Against this evidence, Rosen asserts without any  
 14 support that eBay "often" permits "repeat/serial infringers to continue to  
 15 auction/sell infringing goods" and that "there is a very high probability that a seller  
 16 who receives one NOCI will . . . become a serial/repeat infringer." Motion at 9.  
 17 Such vague and unsupported accusations do not raise a genuine issue of material  
 18 fact as to the reasonable implementation of eBay's repeat-infringer policy. *See*,  
 19 *e.g.*, *Perfect 10, Inc. v. CCBill LLC*, 488 F.3d 1102, 1109-11 (9th Cir. 2007)  
 20 (holding that a reasonably implemented policy can utilize a "variety of procedures"  
 21 and does not require that the service provider "affirmatively police its users for  
 22 evidence of repeat infringement"); *Corbis*, 351 F. Supp. at 1103 ("An infringement  
 23 policy need not be perfect; it need only be reasonably implemented.").

24           Third, Rosen points to no evidence that eBay interferes with, or otherwise  
 25 fails to accommodate, any "standard technical measures" used by copyright owners  
 26 to identify or protect their works. 17 U.S.C. § 512(i)(1)(B).

27           Accordingly, Rosen's allegations of infringement pertaining to listings of his  
 28 8x10 Photos are shielded from liability by eBay's compliance with the safe harbor

1 provisions of section 512(c) of the DMCA. This recognition warrants not only  
 2 denying Rosen's motion for summary judgment as to such listings but also granting  
 3 eBay's cross-motion for summary judgment dismissing those claims.

4           **B. eBay Has Neither Directly Nor Secondarily Infringed Rosen's  
 5 Copyrights in the 8x10 Prints**

6           Insofar as Rosen has failed to establish proper registrations for his works and  
 7 also failed to show that eBay's takedowns of the 8x10 Print listings do not qualify  
 8 for DMCA protection, the Court need not even reach Rosen's claims of direct and  
 9 secondary infringement related to these listings in order to deny Rosen's summary  
 10 judgment motion. Nevertheless, those claims equally have no merit.

11           **1. eBay Did Not Directly Infringe Rosen's Copyrights**

12           Rosen contends that eBay directly infringed his copyrights by various  
 13 asserted acts of copying, distribution, and display of his works. Motion at 16-17.  
 14 As discussed in eBay's cross-motion, however, Rosen's direct infringement claims  
 15 fail because he has not proven that *eBay*, as opposed to eBay *users*, caused any of  
 16 the various acts by which he contends his 8x10 Prints were infringed. Direct  
 17 infringement of any of the section 106 copyright rights requires volitional conduct,  
 18 and “[the] requirement of ‘volitional conduct’ . . . focus[e]s the inquiry on whether  
 19 the defendant directly caused the infringement to take place.” *Perfect 10, Inc. v.*  
 20 *Giganews, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-7098 AHM, 2013 WL 2109963, at \*5-7 (C.D. Cal. Mar.  
 21 8, 2013); *see also Fox Broad. Co. v. Dish Network LLC*, 747 F.3d 1060, 1067 (9th  
 22 Cir. 2014) (“Infringement of the reproduction right requires copying by the  
 23 defendant, which comprises a requirement that the defendant cause the copying.”)  
 24 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted); *Cartoon Network LP, LLLP v.*  
 25 *CSC Holdings, Inc.*, 536 F.3d 121, 132 (2d Cir. 2008). The “pivotal factor” in  
 26 determining whether there was a “volitional act” of infringement is the “initiation  
 27 of the act of copying.” *In re Autohop Litig.*, No. 12 Civ. 4155 (LTS)(KNF), 2013  
 28 WL 5477495, at \*5-6 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 1, 2013), with “copying” understood as

1 “shorthand for the infringing of any of the copyright owner’s five exclusive rights.”  
 2 *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1004, 1013 (9th Cir. 2001) (quoting  
 3 *S.O.S., Inc. v. Payday, Inc.*, 886 F.2d 1081, 1085 n.3 (9th Cir.1989)).

4 The infringing use of a defendant’s automated systems by a third party does  
 5 not render the defendant directly liable. As the Ninth Circuit explained in *Fox*:

6 [O]perating a system used to make copies at the user’s  
 7 command does not mean that the system operator, rather  
 8 than the user, caused copies to be made. Here,  
 9 [defendant’s] program creates the copy only in response  
 to the user’s command. Therefore, the district court did  
 not err in concluding that the user, not [defendant], makes  
 the copy.

10 747 F.3d at 1067; *see also Giganews*, 2013 WL 2109963, at \*7 (finding no direct  
 11 infringement where defendants “simply programmed their servers to automatically  
 12 copy, distribute, and display content, including infringing content, uploaded by . . .  
 13 users”); eBay’s Motion for Summary Judgment at 11 (citing additional cases). The  
 14 record here shows that the eBay sellers who created and uploaded the listings—not  
 15 eBay or any of its employees—directly caused the allegedly infringing copying,  
 16 display, and distribution by uploading the digital images at issue.

17 Rosen’s reliance on *Hotaling v. Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*,  
 18 118 F.3d 199 (4th Cir. 1997), for the proposition that simply making works  
 19 *available* for distribution itself infringes a copyright owner’s right of distribution.in  
 20 violation of section 106(3) of the Copyright Act, Motion at 17, is misplaced.  
 21 *Hotaling* is widely regarded as an outlier whose holding is limited to its peculiar set  
 22 of facts.<sup>14</sup> The overwhelming weight of authority requires a showing that the  
 23 defendant *actually distributed copies* of the works in issue to the public. *See, e.g.*,  
 24 *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 508 F.3d 1146, 1162 (9th Cir. 2007) (in

25 <sup>14</sup> The defendant church’s main library held one “legitimate” copy of the plaintiff’s  
 26 work but made several unauthorized copies for its branch libraries. The issue was  
 27 whether the unauthorized copies available in the branch libraries could be deemed  
 28 to have been “distributed” to the public in violation of section 106(3). Rather than  
 straightforwardly condemn the copying as infringing the section 106(1)  
 reproduction right the court held that the distribution right had been infringed.

1 context of Google’s linking to full-size images on third-party websites, holding that  
 2 “distribution” requires “actual dissemination” of a copy); *In re Napster, Inc.*  
 3 *Copyright Litig.*, 377 F. Supp. 2d 796, 802-04 (N.D. Cal. 2005) (rejecting *Hotaling*  
 4 “to the extent [it] suggests that a mere offer to distribute a copyrighted work gives  
 5 rise to liability under section 106(3)’’); *see also Capitol Records, Inc. v. Thomas*,  
 6 579 F. Supp. 2d 1210, 1224-25 (D. Minn. 2008) (expressly rejecting *Hotaling* as  
 7 contrary to the “logical statutory interpretation of § 106(3), the body of Copyright  
 8 Act case law, and the legislative history of the Copyright Act’’); *Elektra Entm’t*  
 9 *Grp. v. Barker*, 551 F. Supp. 2d 234, 243 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (surveying cases and  
 10 rejecting *Hotaling*’s reasoning as “not grounded in the statute”).

11 Even the case Rosen cites, *Atlantic Recording Corp. v. Howell*, 554 F. Supp.  
 12 2d 976, 983 (D. Ariz. 2008) (*see Motion at 13*), rejects *Hotaling* and concurs with  
 13 “the great weight of authority” that merely making a copyrighted work available is  
 14 insufficient to constitute distribution unless a copy has actually been distributed to a  
 15 member of the public. *Id.*; *see also London-Sire Records, Inc. v. Doe 1*, 542 F.  
 16 Supp. 2d 153, 168 (D. Mass. 2008) (“Merely because the defendant has ‘completed  
 17 all the steps necessary for distribution’ does not necessarily mean that a distribution  
 18 has actually occurred.”).

## 19       **2.       *eBay Did Not Secondarily Infringe Rosen’s Copyrights***

20 Rosen’s attempt to show that eBay is secondarily liable is also unsupported  
 21 by the record. Contributory infringement requires that the defendant (1) have had  
 22 knowledge of the sellers’ infringing activity and (2) have induced, caused, or  
 23 materially contributed to the infringing conduct. *See Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa Int’l*  
 24 *Serv. Ass’n*, 494 F.3d 788, 795 (9th Cir. 2007). A computer system operator such  
 25 as eBay can be contributorily liable only if it has “actual knowledge that specific  
 26 infringing material is available using its system, and can take simple measures to  
 27 prevent further damage to copyrighted works, yet continues to provide access to  
 28 infringing works.” *Rosen v. Hosting Servs., Inc.*, 771 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1222 (C.D.

1 Cal. 2010) (quoting *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 508 F.3d at 1172).  
 2 Rosen fails to make this showing, as it is undisputed that as soon as eBay learned of  
 3 the allegedly infringing 8x10 Prints, it took down the corresponding listings and  
 4 thus did *not* “continue[] to provide access” to those allegedly infringing works. *See*  
 5 *supra* pp. 11-13; *UMG*, 718 F.3d at 1023 (granting summary judgment for  
 6 defendant who “promptly removed infringing material when it became aware of  
 7 specific instances of infringement”); *cf. Napster*, 239 F.3d at 1021-22 (holding that  
 8 contributory liability exists only where the defendant was aware of specific  
 9 infringing material available through its system but failed to remove the material).  
 10 In addition, given its prompt removal of listings for the 8x10 Print listings, eBay  
 11 did not “induce, cause, or materially contribute” to infringement of Rosen’s works.  
 12 *Visa*, 494 F.3d at 796.

13 Nor can Rosen establish vicarious infringement, which requires that the  
 14 defendant have (1) the right and ability to supervise the third-party sellers’  
 15 allegedly infringing conduct and (2) a direct financial interest in their infringing  
 16 activity. *See Visa*, 494 F.3d at 802. Rosen argues (erroneously) that eBay “does  
 17 not dispute that has [sic] the right and ability to prevent its users from infringing  
 18 Rosen’s photographs.” Motion at 21. In fact, although eBay’s policies do prohibit  
 19 copyright infringement by users, and eBay can and does suspend the accounts of  
 20 users who repeatedly infringe others’ copyrights, eBay cannot “prevent its users  
 21 from infringing Rosen’s photographs” because the *users* are responsible for  
 22 selecting the images for their listings; eBay *has no legal, operational or other*  
 23 *control over these third parties’ activities* such that it could preemptively bar them  
 24 from making infringing postings. Vicarious liability requires the right and ability  
 25 “to supervise and control the *infringement*, not just affect it.” *Visa*, 494 F.3d at 805  
 26 (emphasis added); *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 508 F.3d at 1173 (holding  
 27 that Google was not vicariously liable because it lacked the “legal right to stop or  
 28 limit the direct infringement” by third parties).

1            Vicarious infringement requires not only the “legal right to stop or limit  
 2 [users’] allegedly infringing conduct” but also “the practical ability to do so,” *Visa*,  
 3 494 F.3d at 816 n.11, and eBay simply does not have the ability (much less the  
 4 legal obligation) to actively police the hundreds of millions of listings on its  
 5 website for infringement. *See Luvdarts, LLC v. AT&T Mobility, LLC*, 710 F.3d  
 6 1068, 1071-72 (9th Cir. 2013) (holding that mobile phone carrier lacked right and  
 7 ability to supervise infringing conduct on its network given the system architecture  
 8 and the absence of a low-cost, effective way to stop infringement). By contrast, the  
 9 Ninth Circuit held that Napster was likely to be vicariously liable only where it had  
 10 “the ability to locate infringing material listed on its search indices” and failed to do  
 11 so. *Napster*, 239 F.3d at 1024. Similarly, in *Disney Enterprises v. Hotfile Corp.*,  
 12 No. 11-20427-CIV, 2013 WL 6336286 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 20, 2013), *cited in Motion*  
 13 at 20-21, the defendant adopted but failed to properly use technology that it claimed  
 14 was “effective in filtering and targeting infringing works.” *Id.* at \*41. Unlike in  
 15 *Napster* and *Hotfile*, eBay generally *cannot* determine whether items offered for  
 16 sale (or images of them) infringe copyrights. *See supra* p. 5. Moreover, the  
 17 *Napster* and *Hotfile* defendants’ reluctance to use readily available means to  
 18 identify and eliminate infringing material on their sites reflected the fact that their  
 19 online services actually encouraged and accommodated infringing uses. *See*  
 20 *Napster*, 239 F.3d at 1011-12 (describing MP3 music file-sharing service that  
 21 allowed users to copy, index, and distribute music from audio CDs); *Hotfile*, 2013  
 22 WL 6336286, at \*2-3 (describing “file distribution network” that “reward[ed] users  
 23 for giving away access to files they possess”). eBay, in stark contrast, works to  
 24 *reduce* infringing uses on its website. *See supra* pp. 4-6.

25            eBay also lacks a direct financial interest in its users’ allegedly infringing  
 26 activity. *See Visa*, 494 F.3d at 802. As noted, rather than seeking to profit from  
 27 infringement on its site, eBay refunds all fees associated with listings it takes down  
 28 through the VeRO process. *See supra* p. 6. The fees eBay charges are not causally

1 related to infringement, as the vicarious infringement standard requires. *See*  
 2 *Ellison*, 357 F.3d at 1078-79. Unlike in *Napster*, for example, in which infringing  
 3 content was shown to be a “draw” for customers, 239 F.3d at 1023, there is no  
 4 similar evidence against eBay, which is committed to creating a safe trading  
 5 environment that earns the good will of its users. *See supra* p. 4.

6           **C. eBay Is Not Liable for Worthpoint’s Alleged Infringements**

7 Rosen’s effort to hold eBay liable for a handful of 8x10 Prints that appeared  
 8 on Worthpoint—an unaffiliated non-party website with which eBay has no  
 9 relationship of any kind—is based entirely on inadmissible hearsay and speculation.  
 10 *See supra* pp. 7-8.<sup>15</sup> Rosen speculates that eBay is linked to Worthpoint because  
 11 eBay’s licensee, Terapeak (another third party), purportedly provided infringing  
 12 material to Worthpoint. *See Motion* at 6-8. But Rosen fails to explain how these  
 13 independent sets of relationships could lead to imposition of liability on eBay for  
 14 conduct by Worthpoint, and the only record evidence relevant to this claim  
 15 contradicts Rosen’s speculative theory of liability. It shows that eBay: (1) has no  
 16 agreement with Worthpoint; (2) does not license its sellers’ uploaded images to  
 17 Terapeak; and (3) does not transmit image files to Terapeak. *See supra* pp. 7-8 &  
 18 n.8. Accordingly, there is no factual basis for an infringement claim against eBay  
 19 based on the appearance of three of Rosen’s images on Worthpoint’s website.<sup>16</sup>

20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

---

25           <sup>15</sup> *See Soremekun v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.*, 509 F.3d 978, 983-84 & n.28 (9th Cir.  
 26 2007) (rejecting “speculative testimony” and “hearsay” because evidence offered in  
 27 summary-judgment papers “must be admissible”).

28           <sup>16</sup> Rosen admitted that he did not send eBay any DMCA notifications concerning  
 29 images on Worthpoint and that “there would be no reason to send eBay a notice”  
 30 about infringing images on Worthpoint. 56.1 ¶ 118; Rosen Dep. 249:21-250:8.

1           **IV. ROSEN'S CLAIMS AS TO THE MAGAZINE PHOTOS ALSO FAIL**  
 2           **ON MULTIPLE GROUNDS**

3           **A. Digital Snapshots of the Magazines Posted in Connection with the**  
          **Lawful Resale of the Magazines Are Fair Use**

4           Rosen has admitted that he licensed the use of the Magazine Photos in the  
 5 print magazines. 56.1 ¶ 100.<sup>17</sup> Under the first-sale doctrine, “the owner of a  
 6 particular copy or phonorecord lawfully made under [the Copyright Act] . . . is  
 7 entitled, without the authority of the copyright owner, to sell or otherwise dispose  
 8 of the possession of that copy or phonorecord.” 17 U.S.C. § 109(a). Therefore,  
 9 neither the original publication of the magazines nor the resale of lawfully made  
 10 copies of the magazines is actionable. Rosen nevertheless apparently takes the  
 11 novel position that even though one may sell on eBay print magazines that contain  
 12 his work, *posting an image of the magazine in connection with a listing for sale of*  
 13 *the magazine is infringing.* See Rosen Decl. ¶ 9. For the reasons explained in  
 14 eBay’s cross-motion, the Magazine Photos posted on eBay clearly constitute fair  
 15 use. See eBay’s Motion for Summary Judgment at 17-24.

16           As eBay has shown, the first fair-use factor—the purpose and character of  
 17 the use, 17 U.S.C. § 107(1)—strongly favors fair use. The “central purpose” of  
 18 this inquiry is to determine “whether the new work merely supersede[s] the objects  
 19 of the original creation or instead adds something new, with a further purpose or  
 20 different character, altering the first with new expression, meaning, or message.”  
 21 *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579 (1994) (internal quotation  
 22 marks and citations omitted). The incidental use of the Magazine Photos by eBay  
 23 users was transformative because it served “an entirely different function” from the  
 24

---

25  
 26           <sup>17</sup> Perhaps recognizing the significance of this admission, Rosen half-heartedly  
          backpedals in his declaration by vaguely asserting that “some, but not all” of the  
          Magazine Photos “may have been” licensed. Rosen Decl. ¶ 6. But that contradicts  
          Rosen’s prior testimony, see 56.1 ¶ 100, and, indeed, Rosen fails to identify even a  
          single Magazine Photo that he contends was not licensed.

1 original photographs. *Kelly v. Arriba Soft Corp.*, 336 F.3d 811, 818 (9th Cir. 2003).  
 2 As in *Kelly*, where a search engine’s use of the plaintiff’s photographs served a  
 3 different function —“improving access to information on the internet versus artistic  
 4 expression,” *id.* at 818-19—use of the Magazine Photos on eBay also served a  
 5 different function—indicating that the magazine was for sale and allowing potential  
 6 buyers to see the offered item versus artistic/editorial expression.

7 There also is no evidence that this use of the Magazine Photos—a use  
 8 directed at promoting lawful sales of second-hand magazines—would have “an  
 9 adverse impact on the market of the original” Rosen photographs. *Kelly*, 336 F.3d  
 10 at 821; *see* 56.1 ¶¶ 104, 111-12. Thus, the crucial fourth fair-use factor, market  
 11 harm, 17 U.S.C. § 107(4), strongly favors fair use. Indeed, because, as explained,  
 12 the use is transformative, Rosen does not have the right to foreclose it. *See, e.g.*,  
 13 *Bill Graham Archives v. Dorling Kindersley Ltd.*, 448 F.3d 605, 615 (2d Cir. 2006)  
 14 (copyright owners “may not preempt exploitation of transformative markets”).

15 The second statutory factor—the nature of the copyrighted work, 17 U.S.C. §  
 16 107(2)—is of little moment, as it “may be of limited usefulness where [a] creative  
 17 work . . . is being used for a transformative purpose,” *Bill Graham Archives*, 448  
 18 F.3d at 612, nor does the third factor—the amount and substantiality of the portion  
 19 used, 17 U.S.C. § 107(3)—help Rosen. As in *Kelly*, copying Rosen’s photos in  
 20 their entirety was “reasonable” because it was “necessary . . . to copy the entire  
 21 image to allow users to recognize the image.” 336 F.3d at 821. Thus, all four  
 22 statutory factors either favor fair use or are neutral.

23 Any doubt about fair use should be resolved in eBay’s favor due to the public  
 24 benefits that flow from use of the Magazine Photos on eBay. *See, e.g.*, *Kelly*, 336  
 25 F.3d at 819-20 (noting that the defendant’s search engine “benefit[s] the public by  
 26 enhancing information-gathering techniques on the internet”). The predictably  
 27 crippling impact on secondary markets for a variety of legitimate merchandise if  
 28 entities like eBay were barred from permitting sellers to post images of the

1 merchandise underscores the strong public interest in holding that Rosen may not  
 2 restrict the transformative, non-competing use of his photographs in eBay listings.

3       **B. eBay Did Not Directly Infringe Rosen's Copyrights in the  
 4 Magazine Photos**

5 Even if fair use did not protect the Magazine Photo listings, Rosen's direct  
 6 infringement claims would fail for the same reason as his direct infringement  
 7 claims with respect to the 8x10 Prints—namely, that eBay did not cause the  
 8 allegedly infringing acts. *See supra* pp. 16-18. Like the 8x10 Prints, the Magazine  
 9 Photos appeared on eBay's website because *eBay users uploaded them* using  
 10 eBay's automated systems. Accordingly, eBay is not directly liable even if the  
 11 images were found to be infringing. *See id.*

12 As to a handful of the Magazine Photos, Rosen argues that eBay directly  
 13 infringed by “intentionally repost[ing]” listings that had been taken down through  
 14 the VeRO process. Motion at 17; *see also* Rosen Decl. Ex. 176 (identifying in  
 15 “Notes” column certain Magazine listings allegedly “willfully reposted by eBay”).  
 16 But the record shows that it was third-party sellers, not eBay, who created these  
 17 listings and thus “actually caused the [alleged] infringement.” *Giganews*, 2013  
 18 WL 2109963, at \*9; *see supra* pp. 16-18. The listings reappeared on eBay’s  
 19 website because eBay reversed its initial decision to take them down after Rosen  
 20 explained that the printed Magazines did not infringe his copyrights. As a result,  
 21 eBay determined that the posted images of the Magazines were fair use and thus not  
 22 actionable. 56.1 ¶ 101; *see also*, e.g., 56.2 ¶¶ 46, 51. The eBay “repostings” are  
 23 properly viewed not as independent volitional acts but rather as simply  
 24 reinstating/restoring the user-posted listing, which should not trigger separate  
 25 copyright-law scrutiny. To conclude otherwise would penalize eBay for responding  
 26 in good faith to Rosen’s takedown requests while it evaluated the validity of his  
 27 claims.  
 28

1                   **C. Rosen Cannot Establish Contributory or Vicarious Infringement**

2                   As discussed in Point IV.A above and in eBay's cross-motion, eBay  
 3 generally did not immediately take down listings for the Magazine Photos upon  
 4 notification from Rosen because it concluded that these listings made fair use of  
 5 Rosen's photographs. 56.1 ¶ 101. eBay therefore lacked the requisite "knowledge  
 6 of infringing activity" required to support a claim of contributory infringement.  
 7 *Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Netcom On-Line Commc'n Servs., Inc.*, 907 F. Supp. 1361,  
 8 1373-74 (N.D. Cal. 1995). The existence of even a "colorable claim of fair use"  
 9 protects eBay from contributory infringement liability for failing to take down the  
 10 Magazine listings because it is "beyond the ability of a [service provider] to quickly  
 11 and fairly determine" whether fair use applies. *Id.*; *see generally Costar Grp. Inc.*  
 12 *v. Loopnet, Inc.*, 164 F. Supp. 2d 688, 707 (D. Md. 2001) ("Netcom stands for the  
 13 proposition that the bare claim of infringement by a copyright holder does not  
 14 necessarily give rise to knowledge of an infringement."), *aff'd*, 373 F.3d 544 (4th  
 15 Cir. 2004).

16                  Moreover, as with the 8x10 Prints, eBay lacked the right and ability to  
 17 supervise and control its users' allegedly infringing conduct, and it did not receive a  
 18 direct financial benefit from infringing activity. *See supra* pp. 19-21.<sup>18</sup> Rosen  
 19 therefore has no vicarious infringement claim as to the Magazine Photos.

20                   **CONCLUSION**

21                  For the foregoing reasons, Rosen's motion should be denied in its entirety.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27                  <sup>18</sup> eBay refunded the current fees associated with the Magazine listings. *See* 56.2 ¶¶  
 28 87, 115, 131, 144, 158, 243, 246.

1 Dated: October 3, 2014

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

2 By: s/R. Bruce Rich  
3 R. Bruce Rich

4 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP

5 767 Fifth Avenue  
6 New York, NY 10153

7 Attorneys for Defendant  
8 EBAY INC.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**Appendix A:**  
**Works and Uses At Issue in Second Amended Complaint**

<u>SAC Ex.</u>	<u>SAC ¶¶</u>	<u>Item No.<sup>19</sup></u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Published?</u>	<u>Type of Use</u>
Ex. 1	11, 13, 18, 20, 22, 24	12	Sofia Vergara	Yes	magazine
Ex. 2	12, 14, 19, 21, 23, 25	12	Sofia Vergara	Yes	magazine
Ex. 3	15	13	Sofia Vergara	Yes	8x10
Ex. 4	16	13	Sofia Vergara	Yes	8x10
Ex. 5	17	13	Sofia Vergara	Yes	8x10
Ex. 6	26, 37, 43, 51, 59, 65	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 7	27, 38, 60, 66	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 8	28, 39, 45, 53, 61-62, 67	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 9	29, 40, 46, 54, 68	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 10	30, 47, 55	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 11	31, 48, 56	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 12	32	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 13	33	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 14	34	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 15	35, 41, 49, 57, 63, 69	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 16	36, 42, 50, 58, 64, 70	6	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 17	44, 52	8	Joanna Krupa	Yes	magazine
Ex. 18	71	3	Natalia Sokolova	Yes	magazine

---

<sup>19</sup> “Item No.” refers to the number assigned to the work at issue in Exhibit A to Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint, dated December 16, 2013.

<u>SAC Ex.</u>	<u>SAC ¶</u>	<u>Item No.<sup>19</sup></u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Published?</u>	<u>Type of Use</u>
Ex. 19	72	3	Natalia Sokolova	Yes	magazine
Ex. 20	73, 76-77	3	Natalia Sokolova	Yes	magazine
Ex. 21	74, 78, 80	30	Natalia Sokolova	Yes	magazine
Ex. 22	75, 79, 81	29	Natalia Sokolova	Yes	magazine
Ex. 23	82, 84	19	Priscilla Taylor	Yes	magazine
Ex. 24	83, 85	19	Priscilla Taylor	Yes	magazine
Ex. 25	86	21	Daisy Fuentes	Yes	8x10
Ex. 26	87	22	Daisy Fuentes	No	8x10
Ex. 27	88	28	Angela Taylor	Yes	magazine
Ex. 29	88	28	Angela Taylor	Yes	magazine
Ex. 30	89	28	Angela Taylor	Yes	magazine
Ex. 31	90	28	Angela Taylor	Yes	magazine
Ex. 32	91	28	Angela Taylor	Yes	magazine
Ex. 33	92	18	Jeri ("Jerry") Ryan	Yes	8x10
Ex. 34	93	23	Tawny Kitaen ("Tawny Kitten")	Yes	8x10
Ex. 35	94	2	Chase Masterson	No	8x10
Ex. 36	95	2	Chase Masterson	No	8x10
Ex. 37	96	2	Chase Masterson	No	8x10
Ex. 38	97	1	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 39	98	1	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 40	99	25	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 41	100	25	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 42	101	24	Gena Lee Nolin	Yes	8x10
Ex. 43	102	26	Gena Lee Nolin	Yes	8x10

<u>SAC Ex.</u>	<u>SAC ¶¶</u>	<u>Item No.<sup>19</sup></u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Published?</u>	<u>Type of Use</u>
Ex. 44	103	27	Ali Landry	No	8x10
Ex. 45	105	31	Jeri (“Jerry”) Ryan	Yes	8x10
Ex. 46	106	32	Erika Eleniak	No	8x10
Ex. 50	111	33	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 51	111, 112	33	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 52	112	33	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 53	113-114	34	Anna Kournikova	Yes	magazine
Ex. 54	115	38	Ali Landry	No	8x10
Ex. 55	116	39	Anna Kournikova	Yes	8x10
Ex. 56	117, 119	36	Gena Lee Nolin	Yes	8x10
Ex. 59	not referenced in SAC	n/a	Gena Lee Nolin	Unclear	8x10
Ex. 60	120	26	Gena Lee Nolin	Yes	8x10
Ex. 61	118	36	Gena Lee Nolin	Yes	8x10